

Light Flavor Dependence of the Isgur-Wise Function

Tao Huang and Chuan-Wang Luo

Institute of High Energy Physics, P.O.Box 918(4), Beijing 100039, China

(presented by T.Huang)

Abstract

We present an investigation on the light flavor dependence of the Isgur-Wise function for $B_a \rightarrow D_a$ and $B_a \rightarrow D_a^*$ in the framework of QCD sum rules. It is found that the Isgur-Wise function for B_s decay falls faster than that for $B_{u,d}$ decay, which is just contrary to the recent prediction of the heavy meson chiral perturbation theory. SU(3) symmetry breaking effects in the mass and the decay constant are also estimated.

As a heavy quark goes into the infinite mass limit, all form factors for $B \rightarrow D$ and $B \rightarrow D^*$ can be expressed in terms of a single universal function [1], the so-called Isgur-Wise function. The Isgur-Wise function represents the nonperturbative dynamics of weak decays of heavy mesons. It depends not only on the dimensionless product $v \cdot v'$ of the initial and final mesonic velocities, but also on the light quark flavor of the initial and final mesons [1-4]. Here, we apply QCD sum rule approach [3,4] to study its light quark flavor dependence.

In HQET, the low energy parameter $F_a(\mu)$ of heavy meson $M_a(\bar{q}Q)$ is defined by [3]

$$\langle 0|\bar{q}\Gamma h_Q|M_a(v)\rangle = \frac{F_a(\mu)}{2}\text{Tr}[\Gamma M(v)]. \quad (1)$$

In the leading order, the decay constant $f_{M_a} \simeq F_a(\mu)/\sqrt{m_{M_a}}$. It should be emphasized that here and after, the subscript $a = u, d, s$ specifies the light antiquark $\bar{q} = \bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}$ of the heavy meson $M_a(\bar{q}Q)$.

Starting from the two-point correlation function in HQET,

$$\pi_5(\omega) = i \int d^4x e^{ik \cdot x} \langle 0|T A_5^{(v)}(x), A_5^{(v)+}(0)|0\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $A_5^{(v)} = \bar{q}\gamma_5 h_Q$ and $\omega = 2k \cdot v$, one obtains the sum rule for $F_a(\mu)$

$$\begin{aligned} F_a^2(\mu)e^{-2\bar{\Lambda}_a/T} &= \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \int_{2m_q}^{\omega_a^c} ds \sqrt{s^2 - 4m_q^2} [2m_q + s] e^{-s/T} \\ &\quad - \langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle \left[1 - \frac{m_q}{2T} + \frac{m_q^2}{2T^2}\right] - \frac{\langle 0|\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}GG|0\rangle m_q}{4T^2} [\gamma - 0.5 - \ln \frac{T}{\mu}] \\ &\quad + \frac{g_s \langle 0|\bar{q}\sigma Gq|0\rangle}{4T^2} + \frac{4\pi\alpha_s}{81T^3} \langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with $\gamma = 0.5772$. Taking the derivative with respect to the inverse of T, one can obtain the corresponding sum rule for $\bar{\Lambda}_a$.

The Isgur-Wise function $\xi_a(v \cdot v', \mu)$ is defined by the matrix element at the leading order in $\frac{1}{m_Q}$ [3],

$$\langle M_a(v')|\bar{h}_{Q_2}(v')\Gamma h_{Q_1}(v)|M_a(v)\rangle = -\xi_a(v \cdot v', \mu)\text{Tr}[\bar{M}(v')\Gamma M(v)]. \quad (4)$$

Same as above, it is not difficult to get the sum rule for the Isgur-Wise function

$$\xi_a(y, \mu) = \frac{K(T, \omega_a^c, y)}{K(T, \omega_a^c, 1)}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$K(T, \omega_a^c, y) = \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{2}{1+y}\right)^2 \int_{m_q}^{\omega_a^c} \sqrt{s^2 - 4m_q^2} d\alpha [\alpha + (1+y)m_q] \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 2(1+y)m_q^2} e^{-\alpha/T}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - < 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 > [1 - \frac{m_q}{2T} + \frac{m_q^2}{4T^2}(1+y)] \\
& + < 0 | \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} GG | 0 > [\frac{y-1}{48T(1+y)} - \frac{m_q}{4T^2}(\gamma - 0.5 - \ln \frac{T}{\mu})] \\
& + \frac{q_s < 0 | \bar{q}\sigma Gq | 0 >}{4T^2} \frac{2y+1}{3} + \frac{4\pi\alpha_s < 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 >^2}{81T^3} y.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In the above derivation, we have used the sum rule for $F_a(\mu)$.

In the numerical analysis of sum rules, we take the parameters such as condensates and m_q as in [3-4] and set the scale $\mu = 1GeV$. For the continuum model $\omega^c = \sigma(y)\omega_a^c$, we use the experiment preferred model $\sigma(y) = \frac{y+1}{2y}$ as in [3].

Evaluations of sum rules for F_a and $\bar{\Lambda}_a$ give

$$\bar{\Lambda}_s \simeq 0.62 \pm 0.07 GeV, \quad F_s \simeq 0.36 \pm 0.05 GeV^{3/2}, \tag{7}$$

$$\bar{\Lambda}_{u,d} \simeq 0.55 \pm 0.07 GeV, \quad F_{u,d} \simeq 0.32 \pm 0.05 GeV^{3/2}. \tag{8}$$

However, in order to reduce the errors, writing the mass difference $\Delta M = m_{M_s} - m_{M_{u,d}} = \bar{\Lambda}_s - \bar{\Lambda}_{u,d}$ and the ratio $R_F = F_s/F_{u,d}$ with the corresponding sum rules, one gets $\Delta M = 69 \pm 5 MeV$, which is in good agreement with the recent experiment results [5,6] $m_{B_s} - m_B = 90 \pm 6 MeV, m_{D_s} - m_D = 99.5 \pm 0.6 MeV$, and the ratio $R_F = 1.13 \pm 0.01$.

In Fig.1, the Isgur-Wise function ξ_s is shown as a function of y . Obviously, the dependence on the parameters ω_s^c and T is very weak. At the center of the sum rule window $T=0.8GeV$, we obtain the slope parameter ϱ_a^2 defined as $\varrho_a^2 = -\xi'_a(y=1, \mu)$

$$\varrho_s^2 = 1.09 \pm 0.04, \tag{9}$$

the uncertainty is due to the variation of ω_s^c . One can compare with

$$\varrho_{u,d}^2 = 1.01 \pm 0.02. \tag{10}$$

and find that SU(3) breaking effects in the slope parameter is not large but the important thing is

$$\varrho_s^2 > \varrho_{u,d}^2. \quad (11)$$

This result just indicates that the Isgur-Wise function ξ_s falls faster than the Isgur-Wise function $\xi_{u,d}$ as shown below.

In Fig.2, we show $R_{IW} = \xi_s/\xi_{u,d}$ as a function of y at $T = 0.8GeV$ for different $\omega_{u,d}^c = 1.7 \sim 2.3GeV$ and $\omega_s^c = \omega_{u,d}^c + 0.1GeV$. One can find that the ratio R_{IW} displays a soft dependence on $\omega_{u,d,s}^c$. At $y = 1.6$ ($q^2 = 0$ for $B_{u,d} \rightarrow D_{u,d} + l\nu$), we get from the sum rule

$$R_{IW} \simeq (95 \pm 2)\%, \quad (12)$$

where the uncertainty is ascribed to the uncertainty in $\omega_{u,d,s}^c$ and T .

In the evaluations of sum rules for ξ_a and R_{IW} , the continuum model is chosen as $\sigma(y) = \frac{y+1}{2y}$. This may cause large errors in ξ_a and R_{IW} . As discussed in [3], one knows

$$\sigma_{min} = \frac{y+1-\sqrt{y^2-1}}{2} \leq \sigma(y) \leq \sigma_{max} = 1, \quad (13)$$

and the model σ_{max} and σ_{min} respectively constituents the upper bound and the lower bound for ξ_a . However, for R_{IW} , the model σ_{max} and σ_{min} just give the lower bound and the upper bound respectively. Although different continuum model gives different value for R_{IW} , one can find that all of these values clearly give

$$R_{IW} < 1, \text{ for } y \neq 1. \quad (14)$$

Therefore we conclude that $R_{IW} < 1$ (for $y \neq 1$) is independent of the model choice $\sigma(y)$.

In summary, It is very interesting to find that the Isgur-Wise function for $B_s \rightarrow D_s$ falls faster than the Isgur-Wise function for $B_{u,d} \rightarrow D_{u,d}$, which is just contrary to the

prediction of the heavy meson chiral perturbation theory where only SU(3) breaking chiral loops are calculated [2]. Our result $R_{IW} \leq 1$ agrees with that of other calculations [7]. It is expected that the future experiments can test this result and reveal the underlying mechanism of SU(3) breaking effects.

References

- [1] N.Isgur and M.B.Wise, Phys.Lett.B232,113(1989); 237,527(1989).
- [2] E.Jenkins and M.J.Savage, Phys.Lett.B281,331(1992).
- [3] M.Neubert, Phys.Rev.D45,2451(1992).
- [4] T.Huang and C.W.Luo, BIHEP-TH-94-10 (hep-ph/9408303), to appear in Phys.Rev.D50,No7,October,1994.
- [5] D.Buskulic et.al., Phys.Lett.B311, 425(1993).
- [6] Particle Data Group, Phys.Rev.D45, Part II(1992).
- [7] M.Neubert and V.Rieckert, Nucl.Phys.B382,97(1992);
F.Close, these Proceedings;
J.Shigemitsu, these Proceedings.

Figure Captions

Fig.1: The Isgur-Wise function ξ_s as a function of y . The band corresponds to variations of ω_s^c in $1.8GeV \sim 2.4GeV$ and T in $0.7GeV \sim 0.9GeV$.

Fig.2: The ratio $R_{IW} = \xi_s/\xi_{u,d}$ as a function of y at $T=0.8\text{GeV}$ ($\omega_s^c = \omega_{u,d}^c + 0.1\text{GeV}$): Dashed line: $\omega_{u,d}^c = 1.7\text{GeV}$, Solid line: $\omega_{u,d}^c = 2.0\text{GeV}$, Dotted line: $\omega_{u,d}^c = 2.3\text{GeV}$.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9409277v1>